

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/537,877	06/07/2005	Gillian Antoinette Mimnagh-Kelleher	NI 021259	8406
24737	7590 04/20/20	06	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			SHAH, SAMIR M	
	P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2856	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/537,877	77 MIMNAGH-KELLEHER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
_		Samir M. Shah	2856			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence a	ddress		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DISTRICT OF THE MAILIN	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 F	ebruary 2006				
· -		s action is non-final.				
′—	Since this application is in condition for allowa		secution as to the	e merits is		
-,_	closed in accordance with the practice under E	·				
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
	Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	·4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
· ·	Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
· —	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
	on Papers	·				
	•	_				
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine		Zvaminar			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		· · ·	ED 1 121(d)		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			• •		
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		7.00.001 01 1011111	102.		
	•		(4) (5)			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	i-(a) or (t).			
۵٫۱	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			Stane		
	application from the International Bureau			Otage		
* S	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, ,,	d.			
Attaches	Wa)					
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(DTO 412)			
	e of References Cited (PTO-092) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 📋 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PT0	O-152)		

Art Unit: 2856

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 2, lines 30 and 31, delete "external hose system" and replace it with -- external host system --.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Objections

2. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claims 4 and 8, it is suggested that the symbol used to denote the magnitude of the resultant vector should be changed to -- |a| -- (4<sup>th</sup> line of claims 4 and 6).

As to claim 5, it is suggested that "a" should be deleted and replaced with |a| (last line of the claim).

As to claim 7, add -- the -- before "sensor signals" (4<sup>th</sup> line of the claim) for proper antecedent basis.

As to claim 8, add -- is calculated -- after "resultant vector" (2<sup>nd</sup> line of the claim).

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

<sup>(</sup>b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2856

4. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutchings et al. (US Patent 6,122,960 henceforth "Hutch").

As to claims 1 and 2, Hutch discloses a system for measuring movement of objects including a measurement unit (49) with a plurality of motion sensors/accelerometers operable to produce respective sensor signals indicative of motion/acceleration experienced thereby (column 27, lines 13-20); a processor (52)/microprocessor (56) operable to receive the sensor signals from the measurement unit and to process the sensor signals (measure a distance traversed and the speed of said object) in accordance with a predetermined method (column 24, lines 16-22; column 25, lines 60-61; column 27, lines 29-37), characterized in that the processor (52)/microprocessor (56) is operable to process the sensor/accelerometer signals as respective vector components to produce a resultant vector (figures 3-5 and 8-14; column 9, lines 17-64; column 10, lines 54-61; equations 23 and 32).

As to claim 4, Hutch discloses that the processor (52)/microprocessor (56) is operable to calculate the magnitude of the resultant vector according to the following expression: |a| (or |g|) =  $\sqrt{(a_x^2 + a_y^2 + a_z^2)}$ , where |a| (or |g|) is the magnitude of the resultant vector,  $a_x$ ,  $a_y$  and  $a_z$  are respective sensor signals (column 15, lines 22-30; equation 25).

As to claim 6, Hutch discloses that the processor (52)/microprocessor (56) is operable to calculate the direction of the resultant vector (column 9, lines 28-32; figure 3).

Application/Control Number: 10/537,877 Page 4

Art Unit: 2856

As to claim 7, Hutch discloses a method for measuring motion characteristics of a moving object including a plurality of motion sensors/accelerometers which are operable to produce respective sensor/acceleration signals indicative of motion experienced thereby (column 28, lines 30-35); a processor (52)/microprocessor (56) receiving the sensor/acceleration signals and processing the signals in accordance with a predetermined method (measuring a distance traversed and the speed of an object) (column 24, lines 16-22; column 25, lines 60-61; column 27, lines 29-37), characterized in that the sensor/accelerometer signals are processed as respective vector components to produce a resultant vector (figures 3-5 and 8-14; column 9, lines 17-64; column 10, lines 54-61; equations 23 and 32).

As to claim 8, Hutch discloses that the magnitude of the resultant vector is calculated according to the following expression: |a| (or |g|) =  $\sqrt{(a_x^2 + a_y^2 + a_z^2)}$ , where |a| (or |g|) is the magnitude of the resultant vector,  $a_x$ ,  $a_y$  and  $a_z$  are respective sensor signals (column 15, lines 22-30; equation 25).

As to claim 9, Hutch discloses calculating and storing the direction of the resultant vector (column 19, lines 20-27; column 20, lines 1-20).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,877 Page 5

Art Unit: 2856

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutch as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pianca et al. (US Patent 6,466,821 B1 henceforth "Pianca").

As to claim 3, Hutch fails to disclose that the motion sensors/accelerometers are arranged to be mutually orthogonal.

Pianca teaches multi-axis DC accelerometers consisting of at least two accelerometers/sensors mounted essentially orthogonal to each other (column 5, lines 24-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hutch's apparatus to include motion sensors that are arranged to be mutually orthogonal as taught by Pianca because this would allow additional measurements to be made in orthogonal directions.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutch as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nikolic et al. (US Patent 6,436,052 B1 henceforth "Nikolic").

Art Unit: 2856

As to claim 5, Hutch fails to disclose that values of |a| are stored in a lookup table.

Nikolic teaches a "method and system for sensing activity and measuring work performed by an individual" including accelerometer data being stored on a storage device (25), which can be done by employing a look-up table (column 6, lines 50-51; column 7, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hutch's apparatus to include storing values of |a|, in a lookup table, as suggested by Nikolic because this would enable a later access of these values for further calculations.

#### Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"A continuous patient activity monitor: validation and relation to disability", D J Walker, P S Heslop C J Plummer, T Essex and S Chandler.

US Patent 6,160,478 to Jacobsen et al.

US Patent 6,077,236 to Cunningham.

US Patent 5,573,013 to Conlan.

US Patent Application Publication 2002/0109600 A1 to Mault et al.

US Patent 5,807,283 to Ng.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,877 Page 7

Art Unit: 2856

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samir M. Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-2671. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on (571) 272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMS 4/7/2006

HEZRON WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800